



TOWN OF LAUDERDALE-BY-THE-SEA

AGENDA ITEM REQUEST FORM

	Develo	opment Service	ces				5	B		
	Departm	ent Submitting Requ	iest				D	Dept Head's S.	gnature 50	
	Commission Meeting Dates	Last date to turn in to Town Clerk's Office]	Commission Meeting Dates		e to turn in to lerk's Office		Commission Meeting Dates	Last date to turn in to Town Clerk's Office	
	Nov 10, 2009	Oct. 30 (5:00 p.m.)		an 26, 2010	Jan 15 (5:00 p.m.)		March 23, 2010	Mar 12 (5:00 p.m.)	
	Dec 1, 2009	Nov 20 (5:00 p.m.)		eb 9, 2010	Jan 29 (5:00 p.m.)		April 13, 2010	April 2 (5:00p.m.)	
	Dec 8, 2009	Nov 25 (5:00 p.m.)	⊠ I	eb 23, 2010	Feb 12 ((5:00 p.m.)		April 27, 2010	April 16 (5:00p.m.)	
	Jan 12, 2010	Dec 31 (5:00 p.m.)		Mar 4, 2010	Feb 19 (5:00p.m.)		May 11, 2010	April 30 (5:00p.m.)	
AGE		Discussion and or Broward County. Ba	Report Conse Bids action	nt Agenda to approve	the Sec	Resolutio Ordinance Public He Old Busin	e earing ness		New Business Manager's Report Attorney's Report Other nt) for the Public Schoo	1
	By Com	nmissioner	C	OTTEY					TETING ON FED	в 23 -
	ROUNDTA	HBLE DISCU	SSIO	U By	Vice	MA	YOR	Q QOQ -	MOETING FOR	
Town	Attorney review Yes	required No						Town Ma	nager's Initials:	

Jeff Bowman

From:

Linda Houchins [linda.houchins@browardschools.com]

Sent: Tue 2/2/2010 3:13 PM

To:

srose@creekgov.net; sstoudenmire@creekgov.net; shess@coralsprings.org; eliston@coralsprings.org; jhickey@coralsprings.org; MWood@coopercityfl.org; cchurch@ci.dania-beach.fl.us; bdaniels@ci.dania-beach.fl.us; grace_hall@davie-fl.gov; ingrid_allen@davie-fl.gov; David_Quigley@davie-fl.gov; jferguson@deerfield-beach.com; mciesielski@fortlauderdale.gov; jkoeth@fortlauderdale.gov; afajardo@fortlauderdale.gov; rcross@fortlauderdale.gov; jkoeth@fortlauderdale.gov; tlodge@fortlauderdale.gov; jfrastai@hallandalebeach.org; rcannone@hallandalebeach.org; ssuarez@hallandalebeachfl.gov; fleiva@hallandalebeachfl.gov; eichners@calvingiordano.com; ssinatra@calvin-giordano.com; jepstein@hollywoodfl.org; jmathison@hollywoodfl.org; John Olinzock; Jeff Bowman; garyr@lauderdalelakes.org; danh@lauderdalelakes.org; ehahn@lauderhill-fl.gov; dgiancoli@lauderhill-fl.gov; rgcoker@coker-feiner.com; cityplanner@margatefl.com; deesplanner@margatefl.com; hczombek@ci.miramar.fl.us; bkhack@ci.miramar.fl.us; llhall@ci.miramar.fl.us; tholguin@nlauderdale.org; $thern and ez@nlauder dale.org;\ reagany@oaklandpark fl.org;\ rick b@oaklandpark fl.org;$ cqardneryounq@cityofparkland.org; rmoore@cityofparkland.org; barcher@cityofparkland.org; swilliams@ppines.com; dfrank@ppines.com; mberkley@plantation.org; lzelch@plantation.org; lleeds@plantation.org; larry.schuster@copbfl.com; bswing@cityofsunrise.org; cfreeman@cityofsunrise.org; JSesodia@cityofsunrise.org; michele@mmaplanning.com; heather@TMPGplanning.com; dteetsel@gmail.com; travis@mmaplanning.com; bob@TMPGplanning.com; jenniferb@tamarac.org; abarnes@wiltonmanors.com; wthies@wiltonmanors.com; pdokuchitz@wiltonmanors.com; pross@broward.org; gamoruso@broward.org; pschwarz@broward.org; hsniezek@broward.org; bblake@broward.org; dvonstetina@broward.org; strevarthen@wsh-law.com; tleonard@broward.org; Tom Coates; Leslie M. Brown; Jill L. Young; Patrick Sipple; Charles P. Webster; Jonathan Peservich; James E. Kale; Lisa Wight; Omar Shim; Pamela C. Norwood; Rafiki O. Brown; Jeffrey S. Whitney; Chris Akagbosu; Mohammed Rasheduzzaman

Cc:

agabriel@wsh-law.com; chuckfink@bellsouth.net; orsh@bellsouth.net; Christine A. Young; Valarie Marchetti; Delores Burrell; Requel L. Bell; Thelma J. Robinson; Judy Carto; sterling39@aol.com; john@jmmpa.com; nicholsj@gtlaw.com; wright_erica@bellsouth.net; aowpa@gsta.net; ls1@gsta.net; bloc@bellsouth.net; khamilton@sfrpc.com; bthomson@co.palm-beach.fl.us; cedcofsfla@aol.com

Subject:

Second Amended ILA

Attachments:

Dear SWG Members,

This is to advise you that the Second Amended ILA was formally approved today by the School Board. Please obtain the approved Agreement and related Exhibits from the Growth Management Website which is listed below.

http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/propertymgmt/Growth% 5FManagement/meetings.asp

The information is listed under Oversight Committee Meetings, Backup Materials.

Furthermore, please use the Agreement and related Exhibits when you schedule the Second Amended ILA for formal action by your local governing body. As you are aware and as shown in the tentative schedule regarding the Agreement, the desire is for all the Municipalities to take formal action to approve the Second Amended ILA no later than the end of May 2010. Please note that this does not preclude Municipalities from taking formal action sooner.

If you have any questions, please contact Chris Akagbosu at chris.akagbosu@browardschools.com or 754-321-2177. Thank you.

Linda Houchins, Secretary IV
Facility Management, Planning & Site Acquisition
Growth Management Department

Phone: (754) 321-2177 Fax: (754) 321-2179 Email: linda.houchins@browardschools.com

Summary of Amendments

List of Amendments to the Amended Interlocal Agreement for Public School Facility Planning (ILA)

ILA Section	Summary of Existing Provision	Proposed Change	Amendment Origin
Introduction	N/A	 Rename to "second" Amended ILA Add Lauderdale-By-The-Sea as a Signatory 	School Board
4.1	1. Established June 30 deadline for annual transmittal of Tentative District Educational Facilities Plan (DEFP) to Local Governments (LG); 2. Establishes deadline of	 Modify to a July 30 deadline; Change to 30 day review 	Staff Working Group (SWG)
	July 31 for LG to provide comments on Tentative DEFP	period rather than a date specific deadline	
4.5, 7.3, 8.2(b)2, 8.11(b)3, 8.13(g)4	Establishes timeframe for sending information regarding approved residential developments to the School District	Substitute Quarterly Reporting Timeframes	SWG
7.10 (a)1	Requires analysis based on available permanent capacity	Modify to be consistent with proposed Level of Service Standard (LOS) of 100% gross capacity	School Board
8.1	Title	Title Change	SWG
8.1(c)	Requires 60 days advance notice to School District regarding proposed school- related amendments	Reduces advance notification period if amendments mimic Broward County's amendment language	SWG
8.2(b)2a	Establishes minimum criteria for required reporting data	Clarifies required reporting information	School Board
8.2(c)1	Establishes required elements of the Five-Year Capital Facilities Element	Inserts language regarding LOS obligations for the Concurrency Service Areas (CSAs) in the LOS Plan within the DEFP	School Board
8.2(c)2	Establishes process to ensure maximum utilization of capacity	Removes reference to permanent capacity	School Board
8.2(c)3	Requires transmittal of support data for the Public School Facilities Element by Oct. 1 of each year	Extends deadline to October 15 to provide adequate time to complete the new five-year projections based on the new 20th Day Enrollment Counts	SWG

Source: Growth Management Department The School Board of Broward County, Florida

8.5(b)	Establishes timeframe for adoption of DEFP by LG	Allows LG adoption of DEFP to occur concurrent with annual update of their Capital Improvements Element as required by the State	SWG
8.10 (a)	Establishes LOS as 110% permanent FISH capacity for each CSA	Amend LOS to 100% gross capacity to sunset in the 2018/19 school year	School Board
8.13 (f)2	Delineates process to determine impact of proposed developments	Removes reference to permanent capacity	School Board
8.13 (f)3	Delineates adjacency requirement	Enables maximum utilization based on gross capacity for a period of time	School Board
8.15 (b)	Requires that mitigation shall not be less than school impact fees due for the units	Clarifies that calculations should be made at the time of payment	School Board
14.1	Establishes procedure for amendment to the ILA	Refines amendment process with regard to the role of the Oversight Committee and the Staff Working Group	School Board and SWG
Definitions	N/A	Inserts a definition for gross capacity and quarterly	School Board

NOTE: Minor amendments to correct scrivener's errors are not reflected in the matrix above.

Second Amended ILA

SECOND

AMENDED INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT

FOR

PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITY PLANNING
BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

February 2, 2010

SECOND

AMENDED

INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT

FOR

PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITY PLANNING

BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

This Second Amended Agreement (hereinafter referred to as "Amended Agreement") is entered into between The School Board of Broward County, Florida (hereinafter referred to as "School Board"), Broward County, a political subdivision of the State of Florida (hereinafter referred to as "County"); the City Commission or Town Council of the Cities or Towns of Coconut Creek, Cooper City, Coral Springs, Dania Beach, Davie, Deerfield Beach, Fort Lauderdale, Hallandale Beach, Hollywood, Lauderdale-By-The-Sea, Lauderdale Lakes, Lauderhill, Lazy Lake, Margate, Miramar, North Lauderdale, Oakland Park, Parkland, Pembroke Park, Pembroke Pines, Plantation, Pompano Beach, Southwest Ranches, Sunrise, Tamarac, Weston, West Park and Wilton Manors (hereinafter referred to collectively as "Municipalities").

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the School Board, County and the Municipalities entered into to an Amended Interlocal Agreement for Public School Facility Planning ("Amended ILA") in 2008 pursuant to the requirements of Sections 163.3180(13) and 163.31777, Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, the Amended ILA adopted each individual school boundary as the Concurrency Service Area, and adopted a Level of Service standard of 110% of permanent FISH capacity for these Concurrency Service Areas; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Sections 163.3180 (13)(d)(2) and 1013.35, Florida Statutes, the School Board committed to annually prepare and update its adopted Five-Year District Educational Facilities Plan, which for the purposes of public school concurrency is considered to be the financially feasible Five-Year Capital Facilities Plan; and

WHEREAS, the School Board also committed to update and adopt the Five-Year District Educational Facilities Plan annually to add enough capacity in the new fifth year to address

projected growth and to adjust the Five-Year District Educational Facilities Plan in order to maintain the adopted level of service standard and to demonstrate that the utilization of school capacity is maximized to the greatest extent possible; and

WHEREAS, the Amended ILA was found to be in compliance by the Department of Community Affairs and is currently in effect County wide; and

WHEREAS, various new facilities were proposed in the School Board's Educational Plant Survey to support the feasibility of the Amended ILA's concurrency Service Areas and Level of Service standards; and

WHEREAS, construction of some of these proposed new facilities were subsequently rejected by the Florida Department of Education due to District wide excess capacity and without construction of these facilities, many Concurrency Service Areas will fail to meet the adopted Level of Service standard within the five year planning period as required by Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, to meet these projected Level of Service standard failures the School Board has proposed to amend the Amended ILA to change the 110% Permanent FISH Capacity for a specified period to 100% Gross Capacity as a means to avoid multiple school boundary changes across Broward County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to its terms, the Amended ILA may be amended with the approval by the School Board, the County and at least 75% of the Municipalities representing at least 50% of the population of Broward County; and

WHEREAS, the parties hereto desire to amend the Amended ILA as set forth herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, for good and valuable consideration the receipt and sufficiency is hereby acknowledged, the parties mutually agree to amend the Amended Interlocal Agreement as follows:

- <u>SECTION 1.</u> The above recitals are true and correct and are hereby incorporated as a part of this Amended Agreement.
- **SECTION 2.** Definitions are hereby amended as follows:
 - Gross Capacity: The number of students that may be housed in a facility (school) at any given time based on the utilization percentage (as established by the State Requirements for Educational Facilities) of existing satisfactory student stations.

Quarterly: Documents or Reports as may be required to be prepared, produced or published four times a year, at three-month intervals.

<u>SECTION 3.</u> Article IV, Coordinating and Sharing of Information, Section 4, is hereby amended as follows:

Section 4

- 4.1 Tentative District Educational Facilities Plan: Commencing no later than June 30, 2007 July 30, 2009, and annually thereafter, the Superintendent shall submit to the County and to each Municipality the tentative District Educational Facilities Plan (hereinafter referred to as the "Tentative Plan"). Upon providing the Tentative Plan to local governments and giving proper notice to the public and opportunity for public comment, the School Board may amend the Tentative Plan to revise the priority of projects, to add, or delete projects, to reflect the impact of change orders, or to reflect the approval of new revenue sources which may become available. The Tentative Plan will be consistent with the requirements of Section 1013.35 Florida Statutes, and include, an inventory of existing school facilities, projected five-year student enrollment projections apportioned by school and geographic area, Florida Inventory of School Housing for each school as approved by the Department of Education, the number of portables in use at each school, the number of portables projected to be in use at each school, five-year capital improvements for pertinent schools, planned new schools, general locations of new schools for the five, ten, and twenty-year time periods, the School District unmet needs and options to reduce the need for additional permanent student stations. The Tentative Plan will also include a financially feasible district facilities work program for a five year period. The County and Municipalities shall review the Tentative Plan and send written comments to the Superintendent no later than July 31, within 30 days after receipt of the draft Tentative Plan, on the consistency of the Tentative Plan with the local comprehensive plan, and whether a comprehensive plan amendment will be necessary for any proposed educational facility for consideration prior to the final adoption hearing.
- 4.5 No later than the 15th of each month Ouarterly, the County will provide by correspondence to the Superintendent, the list of all residential plat(s) granted approval by the Broward County Commission during that preceding quartermonth. At a minimum, the information shall contain the plat name, plat number, residential type, number of units and date of approval. If no plat was approved during the quartermonth, the County will send correspondence indicating so.

<u>SECTION 4.</u> Article VII, Plan Review; Consistency Determination, Section 7, is hereby amended as follows:

Section 7

- As a part of its development review process, the County and Municipalities agree to 7.3 provide a copy of comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning applications (including the allocation of flexibility/reserve units) that could increase residential density to the Superintendent. At a minimum, the information provided shall include the name of the applicant, application/project number, project name, current and proposed use, existing and proposed land use or zoning designation, existing permitted and proposed and type of units, acreage, survey or location map and section, township and range and the anticipated date the local planning agency may consider this item if such date is determined at the time the information is provided. The County or Municipalities shall provide the deadline for receiving comments from the Superintendent; however, the time provided to the Superintendent for submitting such comments shall be no less than fortyfive (45) days from the date the information is provided to the Superintendent. If no deadline is provided together with the information, then the Superintendent shall provide comments no later than forty-five (45) days after receipt of the information. Further, the County or Municipalities will provide written quarterly reports notify in writing to the Superintendent when the application receives final approval from the governing body.
- 7.10 In reviewing and approving comprehensive plan amendments and rezonings (including the allocation of flexibility/reserve units), the County and Municipalities may consider the following issues consistent with applicable governmental codes and comprehensive plans in addition to such other criteria as may be applicable or appropriate:
 - (a) School Board comments provided pursuant to Chapters 163 and 1013, Florida Statutes which may include, but not be limited to:
 - 1. Available permanent school gross capacity until the end of the 2018/19 school year, and commencing at the beginning of the 2019/20 school year, permanent capacity consistent with the provisions provided herein or planned improvements to increase school capacity;
 - 2. The provision of school sites and facilities within planned neighborhoods;
 - 3. Compatibility of land uses adjacent to existing schools and reserved school sites;
 - 4. The collocation of parks, recreation and neighborhood facilities with school sites;
 - 5. The linkage of schools, parks, libraries and other public facilities with bikeways, trails, and sidewalks for safe access;
 - Traffic circulation plans which serve schools and the surrounding neighborhood;

- 7. The provision of off-site signalization, signage, access improvements, and sidewalks to serve schools;
- 8. The inclusion of school bus stops and turnarounds; and
- 9. The installation of appropriate buffers such as, but not limited to, a solid fence or concrete wall, solid hedges or increased setbacks that will ensure compatibility with the adjacent school for any new development that will be located adjacent to an existing school or an identified future school.

SECTION 5. Article VIII Public School Concurrency Section 8 shall be amended as follows:

Section 8

- 8.1 Required <u>Amendments For Elements of Public School Concurrency Amendments</u>
 - (a) Initial Comprehensive Plan Amendments Related to the Public School Facilities Element (PSFE) to Satisfy Sections 163.3177 and 163.3180 Florida Statute Requirements: The amendments to the PSFE and related amendments to the Capital Improvements Element (CIE) and the Intergovernmental Coordination Element (ICE) in the County's and Municipalities comprehensive plans ("school-related element amendments" or school-related element provisions") required to satisfy Sections 163.3177 and 163.3180 Florida Statutes are being adopted into the comprehensive plans of the County and Municipalities concurrently with the execution of this Amended Interlocal Agreement by the County and Municipalities. Some provisions relevant to public schools may remain in the Future Land Use Element or other elements as may be appropriate.
 - (b) Subsequent School-Related Element Amendments: Thereafter, the experience under the revised comprehensive plans and the School Board of Broward County's adopted Five-Year "District Educational Facilities Plan" (DEFP) shall be reviewed by the County and Municipalities each year, at the Staff Working Group (SWG) meeting to be held no later than March 31, to determine whether updates to the comprehensive plans are required. At the minimum, the School Board's adopted Five-Year DEFP shall be updated annually by the addition of a new fifth year. Any other amendments to the comprehensive plans shall be transmitted in time to allow their adoption concurrently with the update to the School Board's adopted Five-Year DEFP, where feasible.
 - (c) School Board Review of School –Related Element Amendments: Unless proposed by the School Board, all school- related element amendments shall be

provided by the County to the School Board at least sixty (60) days prior to transmittal (or adoption if no transmittal is required). Municipalities that choose to propose, transmit and adopt identical school-related element amendments as the County shall notify the School Board in writing at least one (1) month prior to its local planning agency (LPA) meeting. Municipalities that choose to propose, transmit and adopt school-related element amendments that are different from the County shall provide the element amendments to the School Board at least sixty (60) days prior to transmittal (or adoption if no transmittal is required). The School Board shall review the school-related element amendments and provide comments, if any, to the relevant local government either (i) in writing at least one (1) week prior to the local planning agency (LPA) meeting on the school-related element amendment, or (ii) by attending and providing comments at the LPA meeting.

- (d) Countywide Consistency of School-Related Element Amendments: The County and Municipalities school-related element provisions must be consistent with each other and with the School Board's facilities plan and policies. Each Municipality may choose to adopt all or a portion of the County's school-related element provisions into its comprehensive plan by reference, or it may adopt its own school-related element provisions. If a Municipality adopts its own school-related element provisions, any goal, objective, policy or other provision relevant to the establishment and maintenance of a uniform district-wide school concurrency system shall be substantially the same as its counter part in the County and Municipalities comprehensive plans. If any school-related element amendment is proposed that affects the uniform district-wide school concurrency system, it shall not only become effective in accordance with Section 14.1 (f) of this Amended Once these amendments become effective, then the new requirement shall apply countywide. Each Municipality and the County may adopt the School Board's adopted Five-Year DEFP into its comprehensive plan either by reference or by restatement of the relevant portions of that adopted Five-Year DEFP, but in no event shall a Municipality or the County attempt to modify that adopted Five-Year DEFP. The County and Municipalities agree to coordinate the timing of approval of school-related element amendments, to the extent that it is feasible to do so.
- (e) Evaluation and Appraisal Report: In addition to the other coordination procedures provided for in this Amended Interlocal Agreement, at the time of the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR), the County and Municipalities shall schedule at least one (1) SWG meeting with the School Board to address needed updates to the school-related plan provisions.

8.2 Specific Responsibilities

- Broward County and the Municipalities, within 90 days of the any comprehensive plan amendments in accordance with this Amended Agreement becoming effective shall amend their respective Land Development Codes (LDC) and adopt the required public school concurrency provisions, consistent with the requirements of this Amended Agreement. Such amendment shall include the public school concurrency management system outlining the development review process for proposed residential developments.
- (b) Broward County and the Municipalities, in accordance with this Amended Agreement shall:
 - 1. Not approve or issue any residential plat or site plan (or functional equivalent) that is not exempted or vested pursuant to Subsection 8.11 of this Amended Agreement until the School District has reported that the school concurrency requirement has been satisfied.
 - 2. Maintain data for approved residential development that was the subject of public school concurrency review. The data shall be provided to the School District no later than 15 days in a quarterly report after final approval of the application by the governing body. At the minimum, the data provided shall include the following:
 - a. Development name, and local government project number, and if known, School District project number;
- (c) The School Board shall do the following:
 - 1. Annually prepare and update its adopted Five-Year DEFP, which for the purposes of public school concurrency shall be considered the financially feasible Five-Year Capital Facilities Plan. The Five-Year Capital Facilities Plan shall reflect the capacity needed to meet the adopted level of service standard (LOS) for the CSAs each pertaining to District elementary, middle and high schools, during the five year period, but no later than the fifth year of the Five-Year Capital Facilities Plan. The data required to demonstrate the achievement and maintenance of the adopted LOS at the elementary, middle and high school level CSAs during the timeframe referenced herein shall be reflected in an LOS Plan contained within each subsequent adopted DEFP.
 - 2. Establish a process to ensure the maximum utilization of permanent capacity at each District elementary, middle and high school and to ensure that the schools are operating at or below the adopted level of service standard (LOS).

- 3. Commencing October 1, 2007 15, 2009, and annually thereafter by October 1, provide the County and Municipalities with the required School District data related to public school concurrency, and related analysis needed to amend or annually update their comprehensive plans.
- 4. Review proposed plat and site plan (or functional equivalent) applications for compliance with public school concurrency requirements.
- 5. As a component of the District's public school concurrency management system, maintain data regarding available capacity at <u>each the District's</u> elementary, middle and high school <u>within each CSAs</u> after factoring the student impact anticipated from the proposed residential development into the database.

8.5 Comprehensive Plans - Development, Adoption and Amendment of the Capital Improvements Element

(b) Any amendment, correction or modification to the adopted Five-Year DEFP concerning costs, revenue sources, or acceptance of facilities pursuant to dedications or proportionate share mitigation, once adopted by the School Board, shall be transmitted by the School District to the County and Municipalities within forty-five (45) days after the adoption. Within one hundred eighty (180) days, the The County and Municipalities shall amend their CIE to reflect the changes consistent with the annual update required by the State to their CIE. Such amendments may be accomplished by ordinance, and shall not be considered amendments to the comprehensive plan, pursuant to Section 163.3177 (6)(b)(1), Florida Statutes.

8.10 Level of Service Standard (LOS)

In order to ensure that the capacity of schools is sufficient to support student growth, the School Board, County and Municipalities hereby declare and establish the LOS as 100% of gross capacity (with relocatable classrooms) for each CSA until the end of the 2018/19 school year; and commencing at the 2019/20 school year, the LOS for each CSA shall be 110% of the permanent FISH capacity—for each concurrency—service—area. By January 2014 the Oversight Committee, in coordination with the School Board, the County and the Municipalities will assess the viability of the 100% gross capacity LOS, and the practicability of reverting back to 110% permanent FISH capacity LOS at the beginning of the 2019/20 school year. The LOS shall be achieved and maintained within the period covered by the five-year schedule of capital improvements. To maintain the adopted LOS when it reverts to back to 110% permanent FISH capacity for each CSA, the School Board

may if necessary, utilize relocatable classrooms (portables) on a temporary basis as an operational solution during the replacement or expansion of District school facilities, or at Exceptional Student Education cluster sites, or in the case of a disaster or emergency.

- (b) The LOS shall be adopted and incorporated into the PSFE of Broward County and the Municipalities' Comprehensive Plans.
- (c) In the review of proposed development applications containing residential units, the LOS for schools containing magnet programs shall be considered the same as stated for each pertinent school level (elementary, middle and high).

8.11 Exemptions and Vested Development

- (b) The following residential plats and site plans (or functional equivalent) shall be vested from the requirements of public school concurrency:
 - 3.3. Any residential site plan (or functional equivalent) which is included within a residential plat or development agreement for which school impacts have been satisfied for the dwelling units included in the proposed site plan (or functional equivalent). Information regarding each residential site plan (or functional equivalent) shall be transmitted to the School District in a quarterly report. In the transmittal of such residential site plan (or functional equivalent) to the School District, the County or Municipality shall state in the transmittal or shall provide additional written information as required in the quarterly report indicating to verify that the units in the application are vested. The County will provide the necessary information to the School Board and Municipalities to identify the vested plats and further specifics to be contained in the adopted land development regulations. As applicable, the Municipalities shall utilize the information provided by the County regarding the vested plat to complete information as required in the quarterly report.

8.13 Review Process

- (f) Utilization Determination
 - 1. It shall be the responsibility of the School District to maintain the CSA boundaries and related data.
 - 2. The School District shall determine the impact of a proposed development to assigned school(s) by performing the following procedures:

- (i.) Deduct the Twentieth Day Enrollment numbers from the school's permanent FISH_LOS capacity. The Twentieth Day count is effective on the twentieth day of the school year until the nineteenth day of the next school year.
- (ii.) Add or deduct capacity from capital projects over the next three years as reflected in the Adopted DEFP, which may include capacity from a new school in an approved boundary that will become effective in the next school year.
- (iii.) Deduct the number of students from development approved per Subsections 8.11(b) and 8.13(g) of this Amended Agreement and anticipated to be built within the next three years.
- (iv.) Deduct the number of students generated from the proposed project.
- 3. If it is determined that there is no permanent—capacity at the assigned school(s) as determined by the procedure described in Subsection 8.13(f)2 above because the projected growth from a residential development causes the adopted LOS to be exceeded in the subject CSA, the School District may, if practical, utilize pertinent options delineated in School Board Policy 5000, to be amended consistent with this Amended Agreement and as may be amended from time to time to ensure maximum utilization at the CSA. Otherwise, all of the CSAs immediately adjacent to the primary impacted CSA will be examined for available capacity before a determination letter is issued indicating that the development has satisfied public school concurrency.

(g) Issuance and Term of Public School Concurrency

4. Upon final action by the Local Government regarding the development, the Local Government shall send—provide information in the written—notice quarterly report to the School District indicating that the development was granted final approval or denied. If the plat, site plan (or functional equivalent) received final approval, the development and anticipated students shall be considered vested for up to five (5) years consistent with the period of the underlying approval beginning from the date the Developer received final approval from the Local Government. Vesting of a plat beyond the five years requires that one of the following conditions are met within the five (5) year period: 1) the issuance of a building permit for a principal building and first inspection approval or 2) substantial completion of project water lines, sewer lines and the rock base for internal roads. If the development was denied, the District shall deduct from its database, students associated with the development. Information provided shall be consistent with requirements stated in Subsection 8.2 of this Amended Agreement.

8.15 Proportionate Share Mitigation Options

Once it is determined consistent with Sections 8.13 (e) and (f) of this Amended Agreement that there is insufficient capacity at the assigned school(s) to serve the proposed development, a development's total proportionate share mitigation value shall be determined as follows:

- (i.) The number of additional (deficit) students generated by the proposed development that would impact school(s) exceeding the adopted LOS, or that would cause the assigned school(s) to exceed the adopted LOS, multiplied by the Florida Student Station Cost Factors for each school type; plus
- (ii.) That development's share of the land acquisition cost for school sites, if any, as determined and published annually in the adopted Five Year DEFP.

No land cost shall be applied to mitigation on property that is already owned or controlled by the School District at the time the proportionate share mitigation agreement is being executed. Relocatable classrooms or facilities shall not be considered or accepted as an acceptable proportionate share mitigation option.

- (a) The proportionate share mitigation proposed to address the deficit student station(s) at the affected school(s) shall equate to at least one permanent classroom when the following occurs: (i) The development generates the need for the additional capacity and that capacity is not available; (ii) No classroom additions are available within the first three years of the adopted Five-Year DEFP to accommodate the student(s) generated; and/or (iii) No School District funds are available to provide the needed classroom(s). Mitigation to address the anticipated student impact that necessitate the need for school site(s) shall primarily be the dedication of land. The proportionate share mitigation options to satisfy public school concurrency requirements shall include the following:
- (b) In no circumstance shall the total amount committed to pay for permanent classroom additions or any of the listed mitigation options be less than the school impact fees due for the units as calculated based on the adopted school impact fee schedule specified in the BCLDC and due for the units as of the effective date of the application for building permit at the time of payment. The school impact fee due for the project shall be considered included in the total proportionate share mitigation amount due or paid, and shall be credited toward the payment of the school impact fee. Specifics regarding the payment of the proportionate share mitigation shall be included within the binding agreement.

SECTION 6. Article XIV, Amendment Procedures, Section 14, shall be amended as follows:

Section 14

14.1 Process to Amend the Interlocal Agreement

The procedures to amend this Amended Agreement shall be as follows:

- (a) The party wishing to amend one or more of the above-listed items shall be the "Initiating Party." The Initiating Party may be the School Board, County, or Municipality subject to the requirements of public school concurrency.
- (b) The Staff Working Group shall review and comment on a the proposed amendment and supporting data and analysis.
- (c) The Initiating Party shall submit the proposed amendment to the Staff Working Group. At the minimum, information submitted shall include:
 - 1. A memorandum letter addressed to the Chair of the Oversight Committee which notifies the chair of the proposal to amend the Amended Agreement and outlining the proposed amendment(s);
 - 2. A narrative describing the purpose of the proposed amendment and a statement regarding the impact of the proposed amendment on the School Board's Plan and adopted Five-Year DEFP, and the Local Government's Comprehensive Plan and other elements of public school concurrency addressed by this Amended Agreement.
 - 3. The memorandum submitted information must also include all data and analysis supporting the proposed amendment. As necessary, the School District will assist the County and Municipalities in the provision of any school related data regarding amendment(s) proposed by them.
- (d) Within sixty (60) days of receipt of a proposed amendment from the Initiating Party, the Staff Working Group shall review the proposed amendment and supporting data and analysis, and provide any written comments or objections recommendation to the Initiating Party, the School Board, County, Municipalities and the Oversight Committee regarding the proposed amendment. on Included in the recommendation shall be whether the proposed amendment is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as required by Sections 163.3177 and 163.3187, F.S. If the proposed amendment is not consistent with the requirements of the cited statutes, The the Staff Working Group shall indicate in its recommendation the written comments on whether it consents to the proposed amendment or, if it does

not, the reasons for withholding its consent reasons for the inconsistency with the cited statutes. The Staff Working Group's recommendation shall be forwarded to Upon receipt of the Staff Working Group's recommendation, the Oversight Committee who shall meet and make a final recommendation to the School Board, the County and the Municipalities regarding the proposed amendment. In order to resolve any objections to the proposed amendment, designees of the Initiating Party may meet and confer with the Staff Working Group prior to the Staff Working Group's submission of written comments to the School Board, County, Municipalities and recommendation to the Oversight Committee.

- (e) If the Staff Working Group is unable to consent to the proposed amendment, the matter will be forwarded to the Oversight Committee for resolution. If the Oversight Committee cannot reach a consensus on the matter proposed amendment, the matter shall be resolved pursuant to the dispute resolution process set forth in Article X of this Amended Agreement.
- The parties agree that no proposed amendment will be implemented without the consent of transmittal of the Staff Working Group's recommendation to the Oversight Committee, the final recommendation made by the Oversight Committee, and agreed to by the County and the School Board, and at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the Municipalities which include at least fifty percent (50%) of the population within Broward County. Where the consent of the necessary parties to the Interlocal Agreement is not obtained, no proposed amendment will be implemented unless it is determined to be appropriate through the dispute resolution process set forth in Article X of this Amended Agreement.
- (g) The parties agree that, once a proposed amendment has the required consent of each of the necessary signatories to the Amended Agreement or is determined to be appropriate through dispute resolution, each party will undertake work program, Comprehensive Plan, and regulatory changes necessary to effectuate the amendment.
- <u>SECTION 7.</u> Except as expressly set forth herein, all terms and conditions of the Interlocal Agreement, and the Amended Interlocal Agreement remain in full force and effect.
- <u>SECTION 8.</u> This Second Amended Interlocal Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument.
- <u>SECTION 9.</u> Upon this Second Amendment being signed by the last required party, this Second Amendment to the Interlocal Agreement shall take effect immediately and shall continue until terminated.

SECTION 10. All other terms, provisions and conditions of the Interlocal Agreement and the Amended Interlocal Agreement not inconsistent herewith shall remain in full force and effect. In the event of a conflict between these Agreements and this Second Amendment, the terms of this Second Amended Agreement shall control and prevail. Any term utilized in this Second Amendment but not defined herein shall have the meaning ascribed to it in the Interlocal Agreement and the Amended Interlocal Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Second Amended Interlocal Agreement has been executed on the respective dates under each signature by and on behalf of Broward County, each of the respective Municipalities and the School Board of Broward County, Florida on this _____ day of _____, 2010.

[REMAINING PORTION OF THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

SIGNATURE PAGES FOLLOW.]

Signature Pages

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

Ву		
Jennifer Leonard Gottlieb, School Board Chair		Witness as to all Signatories Print Name
ATTEST:		
James F. Notter, Superintendent Of Schools		
(CORPORATE SEAL)		
State of Florida, Broward County		
WITNESS my hand and official seal this	day of	A.D. 2010
Print Name	(AF	FFIX NOTARY SEAL)
My Commission Expires:		
Approved as to form and legal content:		
Edward	J. Marko, Schoo	l Board Attorney

BROWARD COUNTY through its Mayor, day of, 2010.	, authorized to execute same by Board action on the
	BROWARD COUNTY, by and through its
ATTEST:	BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
	Ву:
Broward County Administrator, as Ex-officio Clerk of the Broward County Board of County Commissioners	By: Ken Keechl, Mayor
	Day of, 2010.
	Approved as to form by
	Office of County Attorney
	Broward County, Florida
	JEFFREY J. NEWTON, County Attorney
	Governmental Center, Suite 423
	115 South Andrews Avenue
	Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
	Telephone: (954) 357-7600
	Telecopier: (954) 357-7641
	By:
	Assistant County Attorney

CITY OF COCONUT CREEK through its May action on the _day of, 2010.	or, authorized to execute same by Commission
(CITY SEAL)	CITY OF COCONUT CREEK a Florida municipal corporation
	By:
	David Rivera, City Manager
ATTEST:	
By:	
Barbara S. Price, CMC	
City Clerk	
APPROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM:	
AFFROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM.	
By:	
Paul S. Stuart, City Attorney	

CITY OF COOPER CITY through its M on the _day of 2010.	ayor, authorized to execute same by Con	nmission action
	CITY OF COOPER CITY, FLORIDA	
	Ву:	
	Debby Eisinger, Mayor	
	Day of, 2010.	
ATTEST:		
By: Susan Poling, City Clerk		
	APPROVED AS TO FORM:	
	Ву:	
	David M. Wolpin, City Attorney	

By:	By:
ATTEST:	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
	Day of, 2010
	By: Scott J. Brook, Mayor
	CITY OF CORAL SPRINGS, a Municipal corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Florida
city OF CORAL SPRINGS through i action on the _day of, 2010.	its Mayor, authorized to execute same by Commission

CITY OF DANIA BEACH through its Mayor on theday of, 2010.	, authorized to execute same by Commission action
ATTEST:	CITY OF DANIA BEACH, a Florida municipal corporation
LOUISE STILSON CITY CLERK	BY:ANNE CASTRO MAYOR-COMMISSIONER
	BY: ROBERT BALDWIN CITY MANAGER
APPROVED FOR FORM AND CORRECTNESS:	
BY: THOMAS J. ANSBRO, ESQUIRE CITY ATTORNEY	

TOWN OF DAVIE through its Mayor, authday of, 2010.	horized to	execute same by Council action on the
TOWN OF DAVIE, FLORIDA		
WITNESSES:		
	Ву:	Judy Paul, Mayor/Councilmember
A TIPLECT	P	
ATTEST:	Ву:	Gary Shimun, Town Administrator
By:		
Russell Muniz, Town Clerk		
	APPR	OVED AS TO FORM:
	Ву:	, Town Attorney
		, constitution of

CITY OF DEERFIELD BEACH throug	h its Mayor, authorized to exe	ecute same by Commission
action on theday of, 20		
_ ,		
CVIII / OF DEEDENIN D DE LOVE II COM		
CITY OF DEERFIELD BEACH, FLORID	A	
	Attest	(Seal)
Peggy Noland, Mayor	Ada Graham-Johns	
	Tau Grandin jorni	only City Citik
Approve as to Form		
Andy Maurodis, City Attorney		
Thing Municulo, City Thiorney		

action on theday of	hrough its Mayor, authorized to execute same by Commission, 2010.
WITNESSES:	CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
	Ву:
	John P. Seiler, Mayor
	Ву:
(CORPORATE SEAL)	George Gretsas, City Manager
	ATTEST:
	Ву:
	Jonda K. Joseph, City Clerk
	Approved as to form:
	Ву:
	Harry A. Stewart, City Attorney
STATE OF FLORIDA: COUNTY OF BROWARD	
	owledged before me this,2010, by John P. T LAUDERDALE, a municipal corporation of Florida. He is see an oath.
(SEAL)	By:
	Notary Public, State of Florida
STATE OF FLORIDA: COUNTY OF BROWARD	
	owledged before me this,2010, by George DF FORT LAUDERDALE, a municipal corporation of Florida. did take an oath.
(SEAL)	By:
	Notary Public, State of Florida

CITY OF HALLANDALE BEACH Commission action on theday of	through its Mayor, authorized to execute same by, 2010.
ATTEST:	CITY OF HALLANDALE BEACH, FLORIDA
By:	By: MAYOR JOY COOPER
APPROVED AS TO FORM:	
DAVID JOVE, CITY ATTORNEY	

CITY OF HOLLYWOOD through its M on the day of, 2010.	ayor, authorized to execute same by Commission action
	CITY OF HOLLYWOOD, FLORIDA
Attest:(Seal)	
BY:	BY:
Patricia A. Cerny, MMC City Clerk	Peter Bober, Mayor
Approved as to form and legality	
For the use and reliance of the City of Hollywood, Florida, only.	
BY:	
Jeffrey Sheffel, City Attorney	

	-THE-SEA through its Mayor, authorized to execute same by day of, 2010.
	TOWN OF LAUDERDALE-BY-THE-SEA, FLORIDA
	By: ROSEANN MINNET, MAYOR
ATTEST;	
By: JUNE WHITE, TOWN CLERK	
APPROVED AS TO FORM:	
By:	WNI ATTORNIEY

CITY OF LAUDERDALE LAKES throug action on the day of, 201		yor, authorized to execute same by Commission
	CITY	OF LAUDERDALE LAKES
	Ву:	BARRINGTON A. RUSSELL, SR., MAYOR
ATTEST:		
By: HAZELINE F. CARSON, CITY CLER	 K	
Signed, sealed and delivered in The presence of:		
Witness Signature		
Printed Name		
Witness Signature		
Printed Name		

action on the day of, 2010.	ger, authorized to execute same by Commission
CITY OF LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA	
By: Charles Faranda, City Manager	ATTESTCity Clerk, Andrea Anderson (Seal)
APPROVED AS TO FORM:	
By: W. Earl Hall, City Attorney	

CITY OF LAZY LAKE through its Maday of, 2010.	ayor, authorized to execute same by Council action on the
WITNESSES:	CITY OF LAZY LAKE
	By:
	Joe Fodera, Mayor-Commissioner
	Day of 2010.
ATTEST:	
Ву:	Ву:
City Clerk	Joseph Lamberti, Village Clerk
	Day of, 2010.
	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
	Ву:
	City Attorney

CITY OF MARGATE through its Mayor, autho theday of, 2010.	rized to execute same by Commission action on
ATTEST:	CITY OF MARGATE, FLORIDA
By:CITY CLERK LESLIE MAY	By: ARTHUR BROSS, MAYOR
	By: FRANK PORCELLA CITY MANAGER
APPROVED AS TO FORM:	
By: EUGENE M. STEINFELD CITY ATTORNEY	

CITY OF MIRAMAR through its Mayor, Commission action on theday of	Lori C. Moseley, authorized to execute same b 2010.
WITNESSES:	CITY OF MIRAMAR
ATTEST:	
	BY:
Yvette M. McLeary, City Clerk	Robert A. Payton, City Manager
	Day of 2010.
(CORPORATE SEAL)	
	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
	BY:
	City Attorney

CITY OF NORTH LAUDERDALE Commission action on theday of	through its Mayor, authorized to execute same b, 2010.		
	CITY OF NORTH LAUDERDALE, a Florida Municipal Corporation		
	By: Ambreen Bhatty, City Manager		
ATTEST:	APPROVED AS TO FORM:		
By: Patricia Vancheri, City Clerk	By: Samuel S. Goren, City Attorney		

CITY OF OAKLAND PARK through its action on the day of, 2010	s Mayor, authorized to execute same by Commission).
	CITY OF OAKLAND PARK a Florida municipal corporation
	By: STEVE R. ARNST, MAYOR
	SIEVE R. ARNSI, MATOR
ATTEST:	
By:	
JANETTE M. SMITH, CMC, CITY CLE	KK
APPROVED AS TO FORM:	
Ву:	
DONALD J. DOODY, CITY ATTORNEY	Y

CITY OF PARKLAND through its Mayor, authorethe day of, 2010.	rized to execute same by Commission action o
	CITY OF PARKLAND
WITNESSES:	
By:	By: MAYOR MICHAEL UDINE
	Day of, 2010.
By:	
ATTEST:	
By: City Clerk, Sandra Couzzo	By: City Manager, Caryn Gardner Young
(CORPORATE SEAL)	Day of, 2010.
(CORTORATE OLIVE)	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
	By: City Attorney Andrew Maurodis

action on the day of 2010.	Mayor, authorized to execute same by Commission		
ATTEST:	TOWN OF PEMBROKE PARK		
By:	Ву:		
Georgina Cohen	Emma Shoaff		
Clerk Commissioner	Mayor-Commissioner		

action on the day of 2010	선거의 보고 있는데 이 보는데 그 보고 있는데 보고 있는데 되는 것이 없는데 하는데 있다면 없는데 없었다.	by Commission
ATTEST:	CITY OF PEMBROKE PINES, FLORI	DA
Ву:	Ву:	
JUDITH NEUGENT, CITY CLERK	MAYOR FRANK C. ORTIS	
APPROVED AS TO FORM:		
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY		

CITY OF PLANTATION through its Mayor, asday of 2010.	uthorized to execute same by Council action on th
Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of	
	CITY OF PLANTATION
Attest	
Susan Slattery, City Clerk	
By:	
Witness:	Rae Carole Armstrong, Mayor
Typed Name of Witness	
Typed Ivanie of Witness	
	As to legal form:
Witness:	
	Ву:
	Donald J. Lunny, Jr.
	City Attorney
Typed Name of Witness	

CITY OF POMPANO BEACH through i action on the day of, 2010	ts Mayor, authorized to execute same by Commission).
Witness:	CITY OF POMPANO BEACH
By:Signature	By: Lamar Fisher, Mayor
Signature	Lamar Fisher, Mayor
Ву:	By:
Signature	By:CITY MANAGER
Attest:	
By: MARY L. CHAMBERS	_ (SEAL)
CITY CLERK	
Approved As to Form:	
Ву:	
GORDON B. LINN CITY ATTORNEY	
STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF BROWARD	
by as Mayor of	owledged before me this day of, 2010, f the City of Pompano Beach, Florida, a municipal
corporation, on behalf of the municipal corp	poration, who is personally known to me.
NOTARY'S SEAL:	NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF FLORIDA

TOWN OF SOUTHWEST RANC action on the day of	CHES through its Mayor, authorized to execute same by Council, 2010.
	TOWN OF SOUTHWEST RANCHES, FLORIDA
	By:
ATTEST:	
By:CHARLES H. LYNN, TOWN	ADMINISTRATOR
By: DEBRA DORE'-THOMAS, TO	WN CLERK
APPROVED AS TO FORM AND C	CORRECTNESS
By:GARY A. POLIAKOFF, TOWN	ATTORNEY

CITY OF SUNRISE through its Mayor, authorizeday of, 2010.	ed to ex	ecute same by	Commission action
	CITY OF SUNRISE, FLORIDA BY:		FLORIDA
		Roger B. Wishner, Mayor	
	This_	day of	, 2010.
AUTHENTICATION:			
Felicia M. Bravo, City Clerk			
(SEAL)			
Approved as to Form and Legal Sufficiency Office of the City Attorney, Sunrise, Florida.			
Stuart R. Michelson, City Attorney 10770 West Oakland Park Boulevard			
Sunrise, FL 33351 Telephone: (954) 746-3300			
BY: Stuart R. Michelson			

on the

CITY OF TAMARAC through its Mayor theday of, 2010.	r, authorized to execute same by Commission action o
	CITY OF TAMARAC
	By:Beth Flansbaum-Talabisco, Mayor
	Date:
ATTEST:	
By: Marion Swenson, CMC	By:
Date:	Date:
	Approved as to form and legal Sufficiency:
	By: Samuel S. Goren, City Attorney

CITY OF WESTON through its Mayor, auti	horized to execute same by Commission action on the
	CITY OF WESTON, through its City Commission
ATTEST:	
	By: Eric M. Hersh, Mayor
Patricia A. Bates, City Clerk	day of, 2010.
	BY: John R. Flint, City Manager
	day of, 2010.
Approved as to form and legality for the use of and reliance by the City of Weston only:	
BY: Jamie Alan Cole, City Attorney day of, 2010.	(CITY SEAL)

norized to execute same by Commission action of
CITY OF WEST PARK, through its City Commission
By: Eric H. Jones, Jr., Mayor
day of, 2010.
BY: Russell Benford, City Administrator
day of, 2010.
(CITY SEAL)

on the day of, 2010.	its Mayor, authorized to execute same by Council actio
CHEN OF THE TONIAN OPE IT OPEN	
CITY OF WILTON MANORS, FLORIDA	A
By:	
GARY RESNICK, MAYOR	
ATTEST:	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
By:	By:
CITY CLERK	KERRY EZROL, CITY ATTORNEY

Proposed Level of Service

			201	0/11			SOMEON AND AND	V 200 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	201	1/12		,			201	2/13	HE LEGISLA				2013/	/14		11-10		and the second	2014	/15		-
School Name	Projected Enrollment	Relocatable Capacity	Gross Capacity	Over/Under Gross Capacity	6 Gross Capacity	.OS Capacity Level	rojected Enrollment	telocatable Capacity	sross Capacity	wer/Under Gross Capacity	6 Gross Capacity	OS Capacity Level	rojected Enrollment	elocatable Capacity	ross Capacity	ver/Under Gross Capacity	Gross Capacity	OS Capacity Level	ojected Enrollment	elocatable Capacity	oss Capacity	rer/Under Gross Capacity	Gross Capacity	OS Capacity Level	ojected Enrollment	locatable Capacity	oss Capacity	er/Under Gross Capacity	Gross Capacity	
Atlantic West	715	250	1009	-294	70.9%	1	782	250	1009	-227	77.5%	1	763	250	1009	-246	75.6%	= 1	7/07	~	Ü	6	%	-	P.	Re	Ğ	8	1 %	1
Banyan	738	236	983	-245	75.1%	1	751	236	-	-232	-	1	766	236	-	-	THE RESERVE NAME OF THE PARTY O	1	797	250	1009	-212	79.0%	1	784	250	1009	-225	77.79	%
Bayview	554	0	500	54		2	537	0	500	-	107.4%	1	540	250	500	-217		1	779	236	983	-204		1	778	236	983	-205	79.19	%
Bennett	369	0	542	-173		1	381	0		-161	-	1	419	1	-	40		2		0	500	64	-	2	568	0	500	68	113.69	%
Bethune, Mary M.	707	228	-	-595	-	-	719	228	-	-583	_	1	737	228	542	-	-	1	416	0	542	-126	-	-	425	-0	542	-117	78.49	16
Boulevard Heights	801	0	817	-11	98.6%	-	814	0	-	-	100.2%	1	836	420	-	-565	-	1	748	228	1302	-554	-	1	760	228	1302	-542	58.49	1/6
Broadview	945	204	-	-185	83.6%	-	937	204	1130	-193	-	1	931	20	812	24		2	833	0	812	21	102.6%	2	849	0	812	37	104.6%	1/6
Broward Estates	613	-	-	-186	76.7%	-	600	108	799	-199	_	1	592	-	-	-199	-	1	945	204	1130	-185	83.6%	1	941	204	1130	-189	83.3%	1/6
C Elementary	0	E	747	-747	0.0%	-	0	100	747	-747	_	1	592	108	-	-207	-	1	610	108	799	-189	76.3%	1	627	108	799	-172	78.5%	1/6
Castle Hill	671	386	-	-230	-	-	697	386	901	-204	-	1	705	200	747	-		1	0	0	747	-747	0.0%	1	D	0	747	-747	0.0%	16
Central Park	1131	-	1123	8	-	-		184	1123	1	-	1	705	386	-	-196	ADDRESS OF THE OWNER, OR WHEN	1	717	386	901	-184	79.6%	1	719	386	901	-182	79.8%	16
Challenger	803	0	1000	-197	80.3%	-	-	0	-	-179	-	2	1131	184	-	8	100.7%	2	1156	184	1123	33	102.9%	2	1163	184	1123	40	103.6%	%
Chapel Trail	929	116	-	-241		-	-	116		-252		1	887 927	116	1000	-113		1	910	0	1000	-90	91.0%	1	951	0	1000	-49	95.1%	6
Coconut Creek	868	56	1003	-135		-	891	56	-	-112	-	-	886	66	-	-243	79.2%	1	930	11.6	1170	-240	79.5%	1	937	116	1170	-233	80.1%	6
Coconut Palm	1018	238	-	-40	96.2%	-	1033	238		-25	-	-	1056	238	-	-117	88.3%	1	943	56	1003	-60	94.0%	1	980	66	1003	-23	97.7%	6
Colbert	611	(826	-215	-	-	638	0	826	-188	-	-	643	238	-	-2	-	1	1058	238	1058	0	100.0%	1	1075	238	1058	17	101.6%	6 2
Collins	314	28	399	-85	78.7%	1	294	28	-	-105	-	-	-	1	826	-183	77.8%	1	641	0	826	-185	77.6%	1	652	0	826	-174	78.9%	6
Cooper City	694	44	-	-33	-	1	-	44	727	-53	_	-	304 690	28	-	-95		1	310	28	399	-89	77.7%	1	315	28	399	-84	78.9%	6
Coral Cove	793	0	830	-37	-	1	808	0	-	-22		-	810	44	-	-37	-	1	696	44	727	-31	95.7%	1	704	44	727	-23	96.8%	6
Coral Park	580	120	-	-245	70.3%	-	576	120	825	-249	_	-	599		830	-20	-	1	829	0	830	-1	99.9%	1	853	0	830	23	102.8%	6 2
Coral Springs	732	36	-	-211	-	1	718	36	_	-245		1	746	120	-	-226	7 21070	1	607	120	825	-218	73.6%	1	664	120	825	-161	80.5%	
Country Hills	898	276	-	-209	-	1	926	276	-	-181		1	910	-	943	-197	79.1%	1	778	36	943	-165	82.5%	1	870	36	943	-73	92.3%	6
Country Isles	967	-	-	-129		1	962	116	-	-134		1	980	276	-	-197	-	1	939	276	1107	-168	84.8%	1	964	276	1107	-143	87.1%	1
Cresthaven	626	0	705	-79	88.8%	1	-	0	-	-57		1	651	110	705	-116 -54	-	1	967	116	1096	-129	88.2%	1	976	116	1096	-120	89.1%	
Croissant Park	693	44	846	-153		-	724	44		-122		1	718	44		-128		1	661	0	705	-44	93.8%	1	694	0	705	-11	98.4%	1
Cypress	880	36	909	-29	-	1	892	36	_	-	-	1	883	36	-	-128		1	728	44	846	-118	86.1%	1	747	44	846	-99	88.3%	
Dania	480	54	623	-143		1	494	54		-129	_	-	507	54	-	-26	97.1%	1	896	36	909	-13	98.6%	1	885	36	909	-24	97.4%	
Davie	714	90	813	-99	87.8%	1	-	90	-	-	-	-	746	90		-116	-	1	524	54	623	-99	84.1%	1	532	54	623	-91	85.4%	
Deerfield Beach	770	54	739	31		2	806	54	-		109.1%	-	826	50	-	-	91.8%	1	767	90	813	-46	94.3%	1	780	90	813	-33	95.9%	
Deerfield Park	687	0	747			1	-	0	-	-76	-	The Person Name of Street, or other Persons Name of Street, or oth	678	54	739	87	111.8%	2	832	54	739	-	-	2	843	54	739	104	114.1%	2
Dillard	686	36	795	-	86.3%	1	-	36	-	-94		1	ARAS STATE	U		-69	90.8%	1	667	0	747	-80	89.3%	1	694	0	747	-53	92.9%	
DISCOVERY ELEMENTARY	852	0	1000	-148	85.2%	1	-	0	1000	-139	-	1	703	36	795	-92		1	718	36	795	-77	90.3%	1	737	36	795	-58	92.7%	-
Dolphin Bay	893	0	830	63		2		0	_	-	-	1	882	0	1000	-118	88.2%	1	884	0	1000	-116	88.4%	1	894	0	1000	-106	89.4%	
Drew, Charles	615	0	579	36	_	2		0		-	110.6%	2	930	0	830	100	-	2	919	0	830	89	110.7%	2	929	0	830	99	-	2
Driftwood	690	222	780	-90	88.5%	1	PERSONAL PROPERTY.	222	780	-89	_	2	622	0	579	43		2	600	0	579	21	103.6%	2	619	0	579	40	106.9%	2
Eagle Point	1171	76	1304	-133	89.8%	1	-	76	-	-138	-	1	694	222	780	-86	89.0%	1	712	222	780	-68	91.3%	1	707	222	780	-73	90.6%	-
Eagle Ridge	781	0	872	-91		1	786	70	872	-138	-	1	799	76	1304 872	-134 -73	89.7% 91.6%	1	1177	76	1304	-127	90.3%	1	1198	76	1304	-106	91.9%	-

^{*} Results will be addlessed via School Board Policy 5000; ** Schools are non-bounded and therefore do not constitute Concurrency Service Areas Source: School Enrollment Projections 2010/11-2014/15 September 2009 FISH Capacity

		BE 2000	2010	0/11				Constitution vis	201	1/12					2012	2/13					2013/	/14					2014	/15		
School Name Embassy Creek	© Projected Enrollment	Relocatable Capacity	Gross Capacity	Over/Under Gross Capacity	% Gross Capacity	LOS Capacity Level	Projected Enrollment	Relocatable Capacity	Gross Capacity	Over/Under Gross Capacity	% Gross Capacity	LOS Capacity Level	Projected Enrollment	Relocatable Capacity	Gross Capacity	Over/Under Gross Capacity	% Gross Capacity	LOS Capacity Level	Projected Enrollment	Relocatable Capacity	Gross Capacity	Over/Under Gross Capacity	& Gross Capacity	OS Capacity Level	rojected Enrollment	elocatable Capacity	ross Capacity	ver/Under Gross Capacity	Gross Capacity	
Endeavour Primary LC	THE RESERVE AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE	0	1087	-151	86.1%	1	918	0	4,000	-169	-	1	911	0	1087	-176	83.8%	1	880	0	1087	-207	81.0%	1	888	0	1087	0	1 30	+
Everglades	419	28	496	-77	84.5%	1	440	28	-	-56	-	1	428	28	496	-68	86.3%	1	437	28	496	-59	-		443	28	496	-199	-	0
THE PARTY NAMED AND POST OF TH	1084	160	1220	-136	88.9%	1	1082	160	1220	-138	88.7%	1	1062	160	1220	-158	87.0%	1	1067	160	1220	-153	-	-	1079	160	-	-53	-	-
Fairway Flamingo	942	0	970	-28	97.1%	1	957	0	-	-13	-	1	965	0	970	-5	99.5%	1	965	0	970	-5	-	-	966	100	1220 970	-141	-	-
Floranada	764 692	166	1019	-255	75.0%	1	808	166	-	-211		1	780	166	1019	-239	76.5%	1	807	166	1019	-212	-	-	823	166	1019	-196	99.69	-
Forest Hills		0	814	-122	85.0%	1	678	0	-	-136	-	1	673	0	814	-141	82.7%	1	664	0	814	-150	81.6%	-	691	200	814	-196	80.89	
Foster, Stephen	611	36	831	-220	73.5%	-	624	36	_	-207	-	1	641	36	831	-190	77.1%	1	655	36	831	-176	78.8%	-	690	36	831	-123	84.99	-
Fox Trail	623	152	895	-272	69.6%	1	645	152	-	-249	-	1	662	152	895	-233	74.0%	1	654	152	895	-241	73.1%	1	665	152	895	-230	83.09	-
Gator Run	1201	126	1304	-103	92.1%	1	1218	126	-	-86	-	1	1206	126	1304	-98	92.5%	1	1199	126	1304	-105	91.9%	1	1226	126	1304	-230	74.39	-
Griffin	1282	312	1452	-170	88.3%	1	1271	312	-	-181		1	1282	312	1452	-170	88.3%	1	1286	312	1452	-166	88.6%	-	1299	312	1452	-153	-	-
Hallandale		12	687	-102	85.2%	1	588	72	-	-99		1	600	72	687	-87	87.3%	1	612	72	687	-75	-	-	633	72	687		-	-
Harbordale	1155	216	1190	-35	97.1%	1	-	216		-43		1	1142	216	1190	-48	96.0%	1	1161	216	1190	-29	97.6%	-	1165	216	1190	-54	92.19	-
Hawkes Bluff	426 882	220	480	-54	-	1	392	0	-	-88		1	376	0	480	-104	78.3%	1	387	0	480	-93	80.6%	1	391	0	480	-25 -89	97.9%	-
Heron Heights Elementary	766	210	1062	-180	83.1%	1	894	210	-	-168	-	1	878	210	1062	-184	82.7%	1	900	210	1062	-162	84.7%	1	911	210	1062	-151	PURCHASINESS PRINCIPLE	-
Hollywood Central	700	22	1000 709	-234	76.6%	1	763	0	1000	-237	-	1	769	0	1000	-231	76.9%	1	808	0	1000	-192	80.8%	1	818	0	1000	-182	85.8%	-
Hollywood Hills	772	2.2	750	-9	98.7%	1	724	22	-	-	102.1%	2	730	22	709	21	103.0%	2	742	22	709	33	104.7%	2	754	22	709	45	NAMES OF TAXABLE PARTY.	-
Hollywood Park	466	0	593	-127	102.9%	2	774	0	-		103.2%	2	788	0	750	38	105.1%	2	775	0	750	25	103.3%	2	779	0	750	29	103.9%	-
Horizon	656	195	858	-202	78.6%	1	451	0	0.00	-142	-	1	450	0	593	-143	75.9%	1	444	0	593	-149	74.9%	1	456	0	593	-137	76.9%	-
Hunt, James S.	872	193	841	31	76.5%	1	678	195	-	-180	*******	1	664	195	858	-194	77.4%	1	665	195	858	-193	77.5%	1	671	195	858	-187	78.2%	-
Indian Trace	698	174	-	-	103.7%	2	879	0	-	38	-	2	904	0	841	63	107.5%	2	920	0	841	79	109.4%	2	958	0	841	117	113.9%	-
King, Martin Luther	472	77	843	-145	82.8%	1	692	174	-	-151	-	1	716	174	843	-127	84.9%	1	718	174	843	-125	85.2%	1	729	174	843	-114	86.5%	2
Lake Forest	891	232	946	-409 -55	53.6%	1	483	72	-	-398		1	491	72	881	-390	55.7%	1	505	72	881	-376	57.3%	1	511	72	881	-370	58.0%	-
Lakeside	862	54	788	74	94.2%	2	895	232	-	-51		1	910	232	946	-36	96.2%	1	913	232	946	-33	96.5%	1	893	232	946	-53	94.4%	-
Larkdale	442	126	749	-307	59.0%	1	859 442	54 126	100	71	-	2	887	54	788	99	112.6%	2	897	54	788	109	113.8%	2	901	54	788	113	114.3%	-
Lauderdale Manors	563	68	1116	-553	50.4%	1		68	-	-307 -540	59.0%	1	442	126	749	-307	59.0%	1	450	126	749	-299	60.1%	1	470	1.26	749	-279	62.8%	-
Lauderhill Paul Turner	581	0	872	-291	66.6%	1	609	0	872	-540	-	1	567	68	1116	-549	50.8%	1	565	68	1116	-551	50.6%	1	600	68	1116	-516	53.8%	-
Liberty	1124	22	1282	-158	87.7%	1	1150	22		-263	-	1	614	0	872	-258	70.4%	1	639	0	872	-233	73.3%	1	651	0	872	-221	74.7%	-
Lloyd Estates	479	134	727	-248	65.9%	1	506	134	-	-132	-	1	1138	22	1282	-144	88.8%	1	1172	22	1282	-110	91.4%	1	1181	22	1282	-101	92.1%	-
Manatee Bay	1240	180	1320	-80	93.9%	1	-	180	-	-62		1	518	134	727	-209	71.3%	1	528	134	727	-199	72.6%	1	563	134	727	-164	77.4%	+
Maplewood	772	148	973	-201	79.3%	1	791	148		-182	-	1	1246 810	180	1320	-74	94.4%	1	1264	180	1320	-56	95.8%	1	1270	180	1320	-50	96.2%	-
Margate	1087	0	1305	-218	83.3%	1	1076	0	-	-229		1	-	148	973	-163	83.2%	1	844	148	973	-129	86.7%	1	866	148	973	-107	89.0%	
Markham, C. Robert	525	72	709	-184	74.0%	1	535	72	-	-174	-	1	1068	72	1305	-237	81.8%	1	1093	0	1305	-212	83.8%	1	1122	0	1305	-183	86.0%	
Marshall, Thurgood	405	18	763	-358	53.1%	1	412	18		-351	54.0%	1	398	18	709 763	-139 -365	80.4%	1	560	72	709	-149	79.0%	1	618	72	709	-91	87.2%	
McNab	801	18	695	106	115.3%	2	803	18	-	108	115.5%	2	818	18	695	-	52.2%	1	404	18	763	-359	52.9%	1	429	18	763	-334	56.2%	
Meadowbrook	572	152	858	-286	66.7%	1	609	152	-	-249	71.0%	1	629	152	858	-229	117.7%	2	825	18	695	130	118.7%	2	830	18	695	135	119.4%	2
Miramar	896	18	947	-51	94.6%	1	591	18	-	-356	62.4%	1	599	18	947	-348	73.3%	1	646	152	858	-212	75.3%	1	665	152	858	-193	77.5%	
Mirror Lake	571	112	737	-166	77.5%	1	579	112	-	-158		1	573	112	737	-164	63.3%	1	593 575	112	947	-354	62.6%	1	593	18	947	-354	62.6%	

^{*} issues will be addressed via School Board Policy 5000; ** Schools are non-bounded and therefore do not constitute Concurrency Service Areas Source: School Enrollment Projections 2010/11-2014/15 September 2009 FISH Capacity

			2010	0/11		Daniel Control			201	1/12					2012	2/13				1 1	2013	/14					2014	/15		-
	ojected Enrollment	locatable Capacity	oss Capacity	er/Under Gross Capacity	Gross Capacity	S Capacity Level	jected Enrollment	ocatable Capacity	sss Capacity	er/Under Gross Capacity	Gross Capacity	Capacity Level	lected Enrollment	ocatable Capacity	ss Capacity	r/Under Gross Capacity	ross Capacity	Capacity Level	ected Enrollment	catable Capacity	s Capacity	/Under Gross Capacity	oss Capacity	apacity Level	cted Enrollment	atable Capacity	Capacity	Under Gross Capacity	ss Capacity	
School Name	Pr	Re	-Ē	6	%	201	Pro	Re	5	Š	%	100	Pro	Rel	Gros	Ove.	9 %	0.0	roj	Selo	Sous	Ner	9.0	05 (roje	eloc	2023	/er/	Gro	1
Morrow	543	0	831	-288	65.3%	1	618	0	831	-213	74.4%	1	655	0	831	-176	78.8%	1	701	0	831	-130	84.4%	1	796	~	Ö	6	%	
Nob Hill	736	134	857	-121	85.9%	1	720	134	857	-137	84.0%	1	734	134	857	-123	85.6%	1	744	134	857	-113	86.8%	-	760	10	831	-35	95.8%	-
Vorcrest	775	0	921	-146	84.1%	1	800	0	921	-121	86.9%	1	821	0	921	-100	89.1%	1	-	0	921	-100	89.1%	-	-	134	857	-97	88.79	-
North Andrews Gardens	815	108	898	-	90.8%	1	818	108	898	-80	91.1%	1	777	108	898	-121	86.5%	1	793	108	898	-105	88.3%	-	878	0	921	-43	95.3%	-
North Fork	480	58	771	-291	62.3%	1	484	58	771	-287	62.8%	1	485	58	771	-286	62.9%	1	475	58	771	-296	61.6%	1	830 499	108	898	-68	92.4%	-
North Lauderdale	696	0	948	-	73.4%	-	678	0	948	-270	71.5%	1	721	0	948	-227	76.1%	1	807	0	948	-141	85.1%	1	873	58	771	-272	64.7%	-
North Side	448	0	608	-160	73.7%	1	460	0	608	-148	75.7%	1	443	0	608	-165	72.9%	1	453	0	608	-155	74.5%	1	-	0	948	-75	92.1%	-
Nova Blanche Forman **	774	62	-	-62	92.6%	1	774	62	836	-62	92.6%	1	774	62	836	-62	92.6%	1	774	62	836	-62	92.6%	1	476	0	608	-132	78.3%	+
Nova Eisenhower **	793	0	777	16	102.1%	2	793	0	777	16	102.1%	2	793	0	777	16	102.1%	2	793	0	777	16	102.1%	1	774	62	836	-62	92.6%	-
Dakland Park	595	0	828	-233	71.9%	1	653	0	828	-175	78.9%	1	649	0	828	-179	78.4%	1	670	0	828	-158	80.9%	2	793	0	777	16	102.1%	6
Dakridge	706	116	721	-15	97.9%	1	698	116	721	-23	96.8%	1	714	116	721	-7	99.0%	1	709	116	721	-12	98.3%	1	725	U	828	-103	87.6%	1
Orange Brook	790	0	830	-40	95.2%	1	777	0	830	-53	93.6%	1	787	0	830	-43	94.8%	1	788	0	830	-42	94.9%	1	712	116	721	-9	98.8%	1
Oriole	746	36	-	-12	98.4%	1	748	36		-10	98.7%	1	777	36	758	19	102.5%	2	769	36	758	11	101.5%	2	771	36	830	-23	97.2%	1
Palm Cove	931	178	-	-118	88.8%	1	940	178	1049	-109	89.6%	1	961	178	1049	-88	91.6%	1	973	178	1049	-76	92.8%	1	975	-	758	13	101.7%	1
Palmview	641	46	711	-70	90.2%	1	683	46	711	-28	96.1%	1	694	46	711	-17	97.6%	1	691	46	711	-20	97.2%	- 1	710	178	1049	-74	92.9%	1
Panther Run	726	22	800	-74	90.8%		728	22	800	-72	91.0%	1	736	22	800	-64	92.0%	1	730	22	800	-70	91.3%	1	728	46	711	-1	99.9%	_
Park Lakes	1126	90	1304	-178	86.3%	-	1127	90	1304	-177	86.4%	1	1116	90	1304	-188	85.6%	1	1125	90	1304	-179	86.3%	1	1155	22	800	-72	91.0%	-
Park Ridge	439	64	610	-171	72.0%	1	463	64	610	-147	75.9%	1	504	64	610	-106	82.6%	1	511	64	610	-99	83.8%	1	570	90	1304	-149	88.6%	-
Park Springs	935	0	1201	-266	77.9%	1	926	. 0	1201	-275	77.1%	1	929	0	1201	-272	77.4%	1	924	0	1201	-277	76.9%	1	942	64	510	-40	93.4%	-
Park Trails	931	0	1276	-345	73.0%	1	1042	0	1276	-234	81.7%	1	1091	0	1276	-185	85.5%	1	1109	0	1276	-167	86.9%	1	1081	0	1201	-259	78.4%	_
Parkside	830	36	1016	-186	81.7%	1	857	36	1016	-159	84.4%	1	866	36	1016	-150	85.2%	1	879	36	1016	-137	86.5%	1	-	0)	1276	-195	84.7%	
Pasadena Lakes	719	142	884	-165	81.3%	1	716	142	884	-168	81.0%	1	732	142	884	-152	82.8%	1	733	142	884	-151	82.9%	1	923	36	1016	-93	90.8%	
Pembroke Lakes Pembroke Pines	743	88	741	2	100.3%	2	737	88	741	-4	99.5%	1	760	88	741	19	102.6%	2	763	88	741	22	103.0%	2	785	142	884	-144	83.7%	
The state of the s	633	164	763	-130	83.0%	-	-	164	763	-109	85.7%	1	660	164	763	-103	86.5%	1	680	164	763	-83	89.1%	1	695	164	741	44	105.9%	1
erry, Annabel C.	667	174	1073	-406	62.2%	1	-	174		-426	60.3%	1	624	174	1073	-449	58.2%	1	623	174	1073	-450	58.1%	1	630	174	763	-68	91.1%	_
eters ines Lakes	716	216	845	-129	84.7%	1	698	216	-	-147	82.6%	1	731	216	845	-114	86.5%	1	749	216	845	-96	88.6%	1	756	216	1073	-443	58.7%	-
rines Lakes rinewood	790	36	963	-173	82.0%	1	-	36	-	-165	82.9%	1	794	36	963	-169	82.5%	1	777	36	963	-186	80.7%	1	807	36	845	-89	89.5%	_
Plantation	783	202	1038	-255	75.4%	1	785	202	-	-253	75.6%	1	800	202	1038	-238	77.1%	1	815	202	1038	-223	78.5%	1	879	202	963	-156	83.8%	-
Plantation Park	622	0	814	-192	76.4%	1	604	0	814	-210	74.2%	1	626	0	814	-188	76.9%	1	660	0	814	-154	81.1%	1	679	202	1038	-159	84.7%	
ompano Beach	540	0	579	-39	93.3%	1	537	0	579	-42	-	1	555	0	579	-24	95.9%	1	569	0	579	-10	98.3%	1	574	0	814	-135	83.4%	
uiet Waters	578	44	615	-37	94.0%	1	600	44	-	-15	97.6%	1	592	44	615	-23	96.3%	1	606	44	615	-9	98.5%	1	624	44	579	-5	99.1%	
amblewood	1387	300	1666	-279	83.3%	1	1420	300	1666	-246	85.2%	1	1438	300	1666	-228	86.3%	1	1462	300	1666	-204	87.8%	1	1477	-	615	9	101.5%	_2
THE RESERVE THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN 2 I	926	18	1003	-77	92.3%	1	945	. 18	-	-58	94.2%	1	953	18	1003	-50	95.0%	1	977	18	1003	-26	97.4%	1	1002	300	1656	-189	88.7%	
liverglades	673	144	813	-140	82.8%	1	680	144	813	-133	83.6%	1	707	144	813	-106	87.0%	1	688	144	813	-125	84.6%	1	689	144	1003	-1	99.9%	
liverside	644	0	633	11	101.7%	2	647	0	633	14	-	2	645	0	633	12	101.9%	2	634	0	633	1	100.2%	2	644	144	813	-124	84.7%	_
lock Island	785	112	843	-58	93.1%	1	810	112	843	-33	96.1%	1	823	112	843	-20	97.6%	1	816	112	843	-27	96.8%	1	839	112	633	11	101.7%	2
Royal Palm	617	0	580	37	106.4%	2	639	0	580	-	110.2%	2	633	0	580	53	109.1%	2	645	0	580	-	111.2%	2	-	112	843	-4	99.5%	-
Wyai Faiiii	757	160	1034	-277	73.2%	1	743	160	1034	-291	71.9%	1	754	160	1034	-280	72.9%	1	748	160	1034	-286	72.3%	- 4	635	U	580	55	109.5%	2"

^{*} Issues will be addressed via School Board Policy 5000; ** Schools are non-bounded and therefore do not constitute Concurrency Service Areas Source: St hool Enrollment Projections 2010/11-2014/15 September 2009 FISH Capacity

			201	0/11					201	1/12	-				201	2/13					2013	/14			T		201	1/16		
																								Π			201	1/15	T	T
School Name	Projected Enrollment	Relocatable Capacity	Gross Capacity	Over/Under Gross Capacity	% Gross Capacity	LOS Capacity Level	Projected Enrollment	Relocatable Capacity	Gross Capacity	Over/Under Gross Capacity	6 Gross Capacity	OS Capacity Level	rojected Enrollment	elocatable Capacity	iross Capacity	wer/Under Gross Capacity	Gross Capacity	OS Capacity Level	ojected Enrollment	elocatable Capacity	oss Capacity	rer/Under Gross Capacity	Gross Capacity	OS Capacity Level	ojected Enrollment	ocatable Capacity	oss Capacity	er/Under Gross Capacity	Gross Capacity	
Sanders Park	504	130	791	-287	63.7%	1	550	130	791	-241	69.5%	1	552	130	791	-239	69.8%	3	- B	8	ট	6	%	-	Pre	Rel	Gre	1 6	1 %	
Sandpiper	834	22	931	-97	89.6%	1	830	22	-	-101	89.2%	1	832	22		-	-	1	563	130	791	-228		1	599	130	79:	-192	75.75	
Sawgrass	958	0	1184	-226	80.9%	1	977	0	-	-207	82.5%	1	989	0	-	-99	89.4%	1	855	22	931	-76	91.8%	1	858	22	931	-73	92.29	1/6
Sea Castle	993	18	1109	-116	-	-	962	18	-	-147	86.7%	1	969	18	-	-195	83.5%	1	984	0	1184	-200		1	990	0	1184	-194	-	-
Sheridan Hills	602	0	607	-5	99.2%	1	618	0	-	11	-	2	629	18	-	-140	87.4%	1	978	18	-	-131	-	1	999	18	1109	-110	-	-
Sheridan Park	660	10	802	-142	82.3%	1	659	10	-	-143	82.2%	1		- 0	607	22	103.6%	2	639	0	607	32		2	650	0	607	43	-	-
Silver Lakes	762	72	850	-88	89.6%	1	736	72		-114		1	737	10	802	-124	84.5%	1	687	10	802	-115	85.7%	1	710	10	862	-92	-	-
Silver Palms	871	90	896	-25	97.2%	1	873	90	-	-23	-	1	-	72	850	-113	86.7%	1	714	72	850	-136	84.0%	1	711	72	850	-139	-	
Silver Ridge	997	174	1056	-59	94.4%	1	1034	-	-	-23	-	1	882	90	896	-14		1	899	90	896	3	100.3%	2	897	90	896	1	100.19	-
Silver Shores	708	0	820	-112	86.3%	1	698	0	-	-	-	1	988	1.74	1056	-68	93.6%	1	1016	174	1056	-40	96.2%	1	1036	174	1056	-20	white me we work	-
Stirling	664	88	789	-125	84.2%	1	666	88	-	-122	-	1	691	0	820	-129	84.3%	1	712	0	820	-108	86.8%	1	730	- 0	820	-90		-
Sunland Park	342	22	539	-197	63.5%	1	352	22	-	-123	-	-	659	88	789	-130	83.5%	1	666	88	789	-123	84.4%	1	677	88	789	-112		-
Sunset Lakes	1083	- 0	1300	-217	83.3%	1	-	0	-	-187	65.3%	-	347	22	-	-192	64.4%	1	380	22	539	-159	70.5%	1	394	22	539	-145	73.19	-
Sunshine	833	90	875	-42	95.2%	1	819	90		-235	-	1	1071	0	The second second	-229	82.4%	1	1076	0	1300	-224	82.8%	1	1076	D	1300	-224	82.8%	-
Tamarac	1170	0	1290	-120	90.7%	1	-	0	-	-56		1	837	90	-	-38	95.7%	1	843	90	875	-32	96.3%	1	862	90	875	-13		-
Tedder	811	0	1240	-429	65.4%	_	_	0	-	-133	-	1	1189	0	30000	-101	92.2%	1	1196	0	1290	-94	92.7%	1	1234	0	1290	-56	-	-
Tradewinds	1076	310	1524	-448	70.6%	1	-		-	-407	67.2%	1	814	0		-426	65.6%	1	827	0	1240	-413		-	842	0	1240	-398	-	-
Tropical	849	0	943	-94	90.0%	1	826	310	-	-435	71.5%	1	1113	310	-	-411	73.0%	1	1106	310	1524	-418	72.6%	1	1122	310	1524	-402	-	-
Village	817	76	874	-57	93.5%	-	-	-	-	-117	87.6%	1	814	0	943	-129	86.3%	1	830	0	943	-113	88.0%	-	852	0	943	THE REST LESS OF THE PARTY NAMED IN	or to the same of the same	-
Walker	605	0	978	-373	61.9%	1	796	76	-	-78	-	1	778	76	874	-96	89.0%	1	788	76	874	-86	90.2%	1	798	76	874	-91	-	-
Watkins	771	54	868	-97	88.8%	1	628	0	4.0	-350	64.2%	1	613	0	978	-365	62.7%	1	631	0	978	-347	64.5%	1	664	70	978	-76	-	-
Welleby	827	1.24	915	-88	-	-	788	54	-	-80		1	785	54	868	-83	90.4%	1	802	54	868	-66	92.4%	1	780	54	868	-314	-	-
West Hollywood	589	90	669	-	90.4%	1	-	124	-	-110	-	1	818	124	915	-97	89.4%	1	817	124	915	-98	89.3%	1	815	124	THE REAL PROPERTY.	-88	89.9%	-
Westchester	1097	146	1184	-80 -87	88.0%	1	590	90		-79	THE RESIDENCE AND ADDRESS OF THE PERSONS ASSESSED.	1	602	90	669	-67	90.0%	1	611	90	669	-58	91.3%	1	628	90	915	-100	89.1%	-
Westwood Heights	667	72	845	-178	92.7% 78.9%	1	-	146	-	3	100.3%	2	1184	146	1184	0	100.0%	1	1221	146	1184	37	103.1%	2	1200	146	569 1184	-41 16	93.9%	-
Wilton Manors	605	0	615	-1/8	98.4%	1	689	72	-	-156	-	1	661	72	845	-184	78.2%	1	672	72	845	-173	79.5%	1	680	72	845	-		-
Winston Park	1198	0	1191	-10	100.6%	-	588	0	47.4.2	-27	-	1	579	0	615	-36	94.1%	1	605	0	615	-10	98.4%	1	609	0	615	-165	80.5%	-
Young, Virginia S. **	756	0	687	69		2	1217	0	-	-	102.2%	2	1223	0	1191	32	102.7%	2	1194	. 0	1191	3	100.3%	2	1153	0	-	-6	99.0%	-
Apollo	795	416	1656	-	110.0%	2	756	0	-	AND DESCRIPTION AND	110.0%	2	756	0	687	69	110.0%	2	756	0	687	69	110.0%	2	756	0	1191	-38	96.8%	-
Ashe, Arthur R.	740	410	-	-861	48.0%	1	753	416	-	-903	-	1	767	416	1656	-889	46.3%	1	759	416	1656	-897	45.8%	1	753	416	687	69	110.0%	2
Attucks	894	0	1050	-310	70.5%	1	719	0	2000	-331	-	1	735	0	1050	-315	70.0%	1	757	0	1050	-293	72.1%	1	730	416	1656	-903	45.5%	_
lair	1000	306	1227	-333	72.9%	1	878	0	1227	-349	-	1	870	. 0	1227	-357	70.9%	1	886	0	1227	-341	72.2%	1	890	0	1050	-320	69.5%	-
Coral Springs	1668	306	1563	-563	64.0%	1	1029	306	-	-534	65.8%	1	1035	306	1563	-528	66.2%	1	1045	306	1563	-518	66.9%	1	1032	200	1227	-337	72.5%	
Crystal Lake	1394	207	1899	-231	87.8%	1	1629	- 0	1899	-270	85.8%	1	1631	0	1899	-268	85.9%	1	1598	0	1899	-301	84.1%	1	1565	306	1563	-531	66.0%	
Dandy, William E.	986	297	1639	-245	85.1%	1	1450	297	-	-189	88.5%	1	1444	297	1639	-195	88.1%	1	1456	297	1639	-183	88.8%	1	1466	207	1899	-334	82.4%	
Deerfield Beach	-	158	1289	-303	76.5%	1	1007	158	-	-282	78.1%	1	1055	158	1289	-234	81.8%	1	1031	158	1289	-258	80.0%	1	1055	297	1639	-173	89.4%	
Priftwood	1333	238	1671	-338	79.8%	1	1338	238	-	-333	80.1%	1	1418	238	1671	-253	84.9%	1	1473	238	1671	-198	88.2%	1	-	158	1289	-234	81.8%	
alcon Cove		59	1728	-133	92.3%	1	1504	59	-	-124	92.8%	1	1618	59	1728	-110	93.6%	1	1628	59	1728	-100	94.2%	1	1459	238	1671	-212	87.3%	1
ssed via School Board Policy 5000; ** s	2436	920	2243	193	108.6%	2	2442	920		199	108.9%	2	2444	920	2243	201	109.0%	2	2458	920	2243	-	109.6%	1	1615 2465	59	1728	-113	93.5%	

^{*} Issues will be addressed via School Board Policy 5000; ** Schools are non-bounded and therefore do not constitute Concurrency Service Areas Source: School Ehrollment Projections 2010/11-2014/15 September 2019 FISH Capacity

			201	0/11			100 to 10		201	1/12	Edille St				2012	/13					2013,	/14	iralimy Krak	unumh.			2014,	15		_
School Name	Projected Enrollment	Relocatable Capacity	Gross Capacity	Over/Under Gross Capacity	6 Gross Capacity	OS Capacity Level	rojected Enrollment	telocatable Capacity	sross Capacity	wer/Under Gross Capacity	6 Gross Capacity	OS Capacity Level	rojected Enrollment	elocatable Capacity	iross Capacity	wer/Under Gross Capacity	Gross Capacity	OS Capacity Level	rojected Enrollment	elocatable Capacity	ross Capacity	ver/Under Gross Capacity	Gross Capacity	OS Capacity Level	ojected Enrollment	docatable Capacity	oss Capacity	er/Under Gross Capacity	Gross Capacity	Conscity laval
orest Glen	1472	158	1781	-309	82.7%	1	1447	158	1781	-334	81.2%	1	1458	158	1781	-323	81.9%	1	1445	200	0	0	%	-	P	8	9	6	%	NO!
Slades	2015	218	-	-	97.8%	-	2068	218	2060	8	100.4%	-	2077	218	2060	17	100.8%	1	-	158	1781	-336	81.1%	-	1389	158	1781	-392	78.0%	1
Gulfstream	365	58	-	-	52.7%	1	360	58	692	-332		-	375	58	692	-317	54.2%	2	2068	218	2060	8	100.4%	2	2027	218	2060	-33	98.4%	
ndian Ridge	2235	519	-	-	100.1%	2	2205	515	-	-28	-	-	2213	515	-	-		1	369	58	692	-323	53.3%	1	375	58	692	-317	54.2%	
auderdale Lakes	884	317	-	-	-	-	903	317	1258	-355	_	-	957	-	2233	-20	99.1%	1	2192	515	2233	-41	98.2%	1	2084	515	2233	-149	93.3%	
auderhill	565	178	1201	-636	47.0%	-	535	178	1201	-666	-	1	-	317	1258	-301	76.1%	1	987	317	1258	-271	78.5%	1	991	317	1258	-267	78.8%	
Lyons Creek	2012	273	2135	-123	94.2%	-	1864	277	2135	-271		1	1954	178	1201	-709	41.0%	1	544	178	1201	-657	45.3%	1	531	178	1201	-670	44.2%	
Margate	1019	20	1344	-	75.8%	-	1071	20	1344	-271	-	1	1864	277	2135	-271	87.3%	1	1867	277	2135	-268	87.4%	1	1885	277	2135	-250	88.3%	
VicNicol	742	1	1323	-581	56.1%	-	762	0	-	-561	-	1	759	20		-269	80.0%	1	1125	20	1344	-219	83.7%	1	1121	20	1344	-223	83.4%	
Millennium	1620	158	1776	-	91.2%	-	1538	158	-	-238	-	1	1587	150	1323	-564	57.4%	1	756	0	1323	-567	57.1%	1	760	0	1323	-563	57.4%	
New Renaissance	1514	1	1547	-33	-	-	-	0	-	-44	-	1	1519	158	1776	-189	89.4%	1	1608	158	1776	-168	90.5%	-	1642	158	1776	-134	92.5%	
New River	1228	119	-	-	82.3%	-	1221	119	-	-272	-	1	1232	119	1547	-28	98.2%	1	1517	0	1547	-30	98.1%	-	1504	0	1547	-43	97.2%	
Nova **	1383	431	1700	-	81.4%	-	1383	436	-	-317	-	-	1383	436	1700	-261 -317	82.5%	1	1241	119	1493	-252	83.1%	1	1240	119	1493	-253	83.1%	
Olsen	1176		1696	-520	69.3%	-	1142	0	1696	-554	-	-	1175	430	1696	-	81.4%	1	1383	436	1700	-317	81.4%	1	1383	436	1700	-317	81.4%	
Parkway	1138		1666	-528	68.3%	-	-	0	-	-553	_	1	1165	0	1666	-521 -501	69.3%	1	1170	0	1696	-526	69.0%	1	1137	0	1696	-559	67.0%	
Perry, Henry D.	811	171	1325	-514	-	-	780	178		-545	-	1	820	178	-	THE REAL PROPERTY.	69.9%	1	1179	0	1666	-487	70.8%	1	1331	0	1666	-335	79.9%	
Pines	1713		1769	-	-	-	1682	0	-	-87		1	1708	1/6	1325	-505	61.9%	1	793	178	1325	-532	59.8%	1	802	178	1325	-523	60.5%	
Pioneer	1440	51	-	-		-	1447	514		-242	-	-	1446	514	1689	-61	96.6%	1	1721	0	1769	-48	97.3%	1	1723	0	1769	-46	97.4%	
Plantation	977	111	-	-	-	-	1006	119	-	-498	-	-	1008	119	1504	-243	85.6%	1	1450	514	1689	-239	85.8%	1	1470	514	1689	-219	87.0%	
Pompano Beach	1095	198	-	-	-	-	1105	198	-	-129		-	1108	198		-496	67.0%	1	1010	119	1504	-494	67.2%	1	1011	119	1504	-493	67.2%	
Ramblewood	1414	39	1742	-		-	1419	-	-	-323		-	1378	396	1742	-126 -364	89.8%	1	1116	198	1234	-118	90.4%	1	1108	198	1234	-126	89.8%	
Rickards, James S.	949	19	-	-	75.0%	-	915	198	-	-351		-	973	198	-	-	79.1%	1	1418	396	1742	-324	81.4%	1	1382	396	1742	-360	79.3%	
Sawgrass Springs	1314	25	-	-	_	-	1310	257	-	-162	-	-	1317	257	1266	-293	76.9%	1	1017	198	1266	-249	80.3%	1	1049	198	1266	-217	82.9%	
Seminole	1294	31		-	82.9%	-	1236	317	-	-325		-	1284	317	1561	-155 -277	89.5% 82.3%	1	1305	257	1472	-167	88.7%	1	1312	257	1472	-160	89.1%	
Silver Lakes	554	191	-	-	-	-	585	198	-	-708	-	1	612	198	1293	-681	47.3%	1	-	317	1561	-272	82.6%	1	1.287	317	1561	-274	82.4%	
Silver Trail	1714	61	-	-345		-	1660	614	-	-399	-	1	1652	614	2059	-407	80.2%	1	634 1659	198	1293	-659	49.0%	1	692	198	1293	-601	53.5%	
Sunrise	1206	158	-	-		-	1224	158		-177	-	-	1202	158	1401	-199	85.8%	1	1222	158	2059	-400	80.6%	1	1641	614	2059	-418	79.7%	
Teguesta Trace	1614	280	-	-	-	-	1585	286	-	-63	-	-	1588	286	1648	-60	96.4%	1	1598	-	1401	-179	87.2%	1	1254	158	1401	-147	89.5%	
Westglades	1516	317	-	-	85.8%	-	1547	317	-	-219	-	-	1519	317	1766	-247	86.0%	1	-	286	1648	-50	97.0%	1	1576	286	1648	-72	95.6%	
Vestpine	1474	218	-	-54		-	1456	218		-72	-	-	1460	218	1528	-68	95.5%	1	1504	317	1766	-262	85.2%	1	1585	317	1766	-181	89.8%	
oung, Walter C.	1601	55		-388	80.5%	-	1520	554	1989	-469		1	1484	554	1989	-505	74.6%	1	1465	218	1528	-63	95.9%	1	1504	218	1528	-24	98.4%	
inderson, Boyd	2085	115	2926	-841	71.3%	-	2105	119	2926	-821	Name and Address of the Owner, where	1	2046	119	2926	-880	PERSONAL PROPERTY.	1	1490	554	1989	-499	74.9%	1	1510	554	1989	-479	75.9%	
Itlantic Technical **	601		584	17	-	-	601	0	584	-	102.9%	2	601	0	584	17	69.9%	1	2051	119	2926	-875	70.1%	1	2063	119	2926	-863	70.5%	
oconut Creek	2006	78	-	-878		-	2035	784	-	-849		1	2043	784	2884	-841	70.8%	1	601	70.4	584	17	102.9%	2	601	0	584	17	102.9%	2
Cooper City	2282	24	-	-284	88.9%	-	2259	24	-	-307	-	1	2212	24	2566	-354	86.2%	1	1973	784	2884	-911	68.4%	1	1998	784	2884	-886	69.3%	
Coral Glades	2323	1	2659	-336	87.4%	-	2198	0	-	-461	-	1	2277	-0	2659	-354	85.5%	1	2237	24	2566	-329	87.2%	1	2279	-24	2566	-287	88.8%	
Coral Springs	2282	309	3204	-922	71.2%	-	2209	309	3204	-995	-	-	2130	309	3204	-1074		1	2295	0	2659	-364	86.3%	1	2371	0	2659	-288	89.2%	
Cypress Bay	4041	-	4641	-600	87.1%	-	-	-	-	-525	-	-	4162	1330	4641	-479	66.5% 89.7%	1	4200	1330	3204	-1093	65.9%	1	2157	309	3204	-1047	67.3%	

^{*} Issues will be addressed via School Board Policy 5000; ** Schools are non-bounded and therefore do not constitute Concurrency Service Areas Source: School Enrollment Projections 2010/11-2014/15 September 2009 FISH Capacity

			201	0/11					201	1/12					2012	2/13				74	2013/	14					2014/	15		-
School Name	Projected Enrollment	Relocatable Capacity	Gross Capacity	Over/Under Gross Capacity	% Gross Capacity	LOS Capacity Level	Projected Enrollment	Relocatable Capacity	Gross Capacity	Over/Under Gross Capacity	% Gross Capacity	OS Capacity Level	Projected Enrollment	telocatable Capacity	sross Capacity	Over/Under Gross Capacity	6 Gross Capacity	OS Capacity Level	rojected Enrollment	elocatable Capacity	ross Capacity	wer/Under Gross Capacity	Gross Capacity	OS Capacity Level	rojected Enrollment	elocatable Capacity	ross Capacity	ver/Under Gross Capacity	Gross Capacity	OS Capacity Level
Deerfield Beach	2498	499	2847		87.7%	1	2420	499	2847	-427	85.0%	1	2325	499	2847	-522	81.7%	1	2383	499	2847	-464	83.7%		2389	499	2847	-45B	83.9%	and a
Dillard	1521	0	2737	-1216	55.6%	1	1513	0	2737	-1224	55.3%	1	1424	0	2737	-1313	52.0%	1	1444	0	2737	-1293	52.8%	-	1507	0	2737	-1230	55.1%	-
Ely, Blanche	2087	166	3638	-1551	57.4%	1	2036	166	3638	-1602	56.0%	1	2108	166	3638	-1530	57.9%	1	2180	166	3638	-1458	59.9%	1	2314	166	3638	-1324	63.6%	-
Everglades	2869	523	297	-108	96.4%	1	2887	523	2977	-90	97.0%	1	2915	523	2977	-62	97.9%	1	2912	523	2977	-65		1	2947	523	2977	-1324	99.0%	-
Flanagan, Charles W.	3258	736	3034	224	107.4%	2	3311	736	3034	277	109.1%	2	3317	736	3034	283	109.3%	2	3292	736	3034	258	-	2	3224	736	3034	-	Name and Address of	-
Fort Lauderdale	1658	0	2632	-974	63.0%	1	1679	- 0	2632	-953	63.8%	1	1745	= 0	2632	-887	66.3%	1	1817	0	2632	-815		3.000	1881	730	2632	190 -751	106.3%	-
Hallandale	1604	190	1827	-223	87.8%	1	1653	190	1827	-174	90.5%	1	1626	190	1827	-201	89.0%	1	1614	190	1827	-213			1612	190	1827	-	71.5%	-
Hollywood Hills	1984	570	2784	-800	71.3%	1	2017	570	2784	-767	72.4%	1	2021	570	-	-763	72.6%	1	2040	570	2784	-744		-		-	-	-215	88.2%	Acres
McArthur	2212	119	2335	-123	94.7%	1	2206	119	2335	-129	94.5%	1	2228	119	-	-107	95.4%	1	2212	119	2335	-123	-	-	2092	570	2784	-692	75.1%	-
McFatter, William T. Technical **	564	0	584	-20	96.6%	1	564	0	584	-20	-	-	564	0	584	-20		1	564	113	584	-	-	-	2181	119	2335	-154	93.4%	
Miramar	2707	665	3233	1 -524	83.8%	1	2635	665		-596		-	2585	665	-	-646	80.0%	1	2584	665	3231	-20	96.6%	-	564	0	584	-20	96.6%	-
Monarch	2145	238	2360	-215	90.9%	-	2180	238	-	-180	-	-	2135	238	-	-225	90.5%	1	2175	665		-647	80.0%	-	2604	665	3231	-627	80.6%	-
Northeast	2348	71	2427	7 -79	96.7%	1	2303	71		-124		-	2289	71	-	-138	94.3%	1	-	238	2360	-185	-	-	2180	238	2360	-180	92.4%	
Nova **	2115	950	2495	-380	84.8%	1	2115	950	-	-380		-	2115	950		-380	84.8%	1	2313	71	2427	-114	-	1	2326	71	2427	-101	95.8%	
Piper	2735	974	3549	-	77.1%	-	2802	974		-747	-	1	2771	974	-	-778	78.1%	1	2115	950	2495	-380	-	1	2115	950	2495	-380	84.8%	-
Plantation	2221	523	-	-	70.1%	-	2205	523	-	-965	-	-	2204	523	-	-966	69.5%	1	2749	974	3549	-800		1	2775	974	3549	-774	78.2%	-
Pompano Beach **	1220	90	-	-73	94.4%	-	1220	90	-	-73	-	-	1220	90		-73	94.4%	1	1220	523	3170	-928		1	2288	523	3170	-882	72.2%	-
South Plantation	2479	451	2777	-298	89.3%	1	2463	451	-	-314	-	-	2491	451		-286	89.7%	1	2537	90	1293	-73	-		1220	90	1293	-73	94.4%	-
South Broward	2039	0	2288	-249	89.1%		2032	0	-	-256		-	2051	431	2288	-286	89.7%	1	-	451	2777	-240		-	2518	451	2777	-259	90.7%	
Stoneman Douglas	3316	489	-	-	92.9%	-	3308		-	-263		-	3334	489	3571	-		1	2106	0	2288	-182	Married Woman Street		2124	0	2288	-164	92.8%	
Stranahan	1733	166	-	-	68.2%	-	1724		-	-817		1	1727	166	2541	-237	93.4%	1	3314	489	3571	-257	92.8%	-	3260	489	3571	-311	91.3%	-
Taravella, J.P.	2935	428	-	-	77.1%	-	2878	-	-	-929	-	1	2931	428	3807	-814	68.0%	1	1751	166	2541	-790	68.9%	-	1778	166	2541	-763	70.0%	-
West Broward High	2696	0	2755	-	97.9%	-	2705	720	2755	-50	-	1	2647	428	-	-876	77.0%	1	2972	428	3807	-835	78.1%	1	2965	428	3807	-842	77.9%	
Western	3139	546	**********	-	83.6%	-	3133	546	-	-620	-	1	-	0	2755	-108	96.1%	1	2642	0	2755	-113	95.9%	1	2617	0	2755	-138	95.0%	
	3,331	5.40	3.30	1 -014	03.076	1	3133	245	3/33	-620	83.5%	1	3205	546	3753	-548	85.4%	1	3196	546	3753	-557	85.2%	1	3166	546	3753	-587	84.4%	Г

^{*}Issues will be addressed via School Board Policy 5000; ** Schools are non-bounded and therefore do not constitute Concurrency Service Areas Saure:
School Enrollment Projections 2010/11-2014/15
September 2009 FISH Capacity



